



Hornby, E., & Maloy, R. (2017). Fixity, Flexibility, and Compositional Process in Old Hispanic Chant. *Music and Letters*, 97(4), 547-574. [gcw106]. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ml/gcw106>

Peer reviewed version

License (if available):
Unspecified

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1093/ml/gcw106](https://doi.org/10.1093/ml/gcw106)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via OUP at <https://academic.oup.com/ml/article/97/4/547/3072296/Fixity-Flexibility-and-Compositional-Process-in?searchresult=1>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available: <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

FIXITY, FLEXIBILITY, AND COMPOSITIONAL PROCESS

IN OLD HISPANIC CHANT

BY EMMA HORNBY AND REBECCA MALOY*

In the longstanding debates about the oral and written transmission of chant, the melodic consistency of the early Franco-Roman ('Gregorian') chant manuscripts has played an important role. Much of the debate has focused on how the melodies were transmitted before notation. In Leo Treitler and Helmut Huckle's view, chant melodies were learned and remembered through a combination of rote learning and reconstruction according to a set of constraints. For others, however, the fixity of the written tradition has posed a challenge to this view: how could this hypothesised process of reconstruction result in such closely related

* University of Bristol Email: emma.hornby@bristol.ac.uk, and University of Colorado Boulder Email: maloy@colorado.edu. This collaborative work was undertaken within the *Old Hispanic Office* project, supported by a grant from the European Research Council (2013-18).

Manuscript sigla are largely derived from Don Randel, *An Index to the Chant of the Mozarabic Rite* (Princeton, 1973):

- A30 Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid, MS Aemil. 30
- A56 Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid, MS Aemil. 56
- BL44 London, British Library, Add. MS 30844
- BL45 London, British Library, Add. MS 30845
- BL51 London, British Library, Add. MS 30851
- BL52 London, British Library, Add. MS 30852
- BL95 London, British Library, Add. MS 11695
- BN10 Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, MS 10110
- BN56 Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, MS 11556
- Fragment 26 Santo Domingo de Silos, Biblioteca del Monasterio, fragment 26
- Lamego Palacio Episcopal de Lamego, fragment 1
- L8 León Cathedral Archive, MS 8
- León F-5 León cathedral archive, fragment F-5
- M-418 Zaragoza, Library of the Faculty of Law, MS M-418
- PB99 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS nouv. acq. lat. 2199
- Sal Biblioteca Histórica de la Universidad de Salamanca MS 2668
- Sant Biblioteca de la Universidad de Santiago de Compostela MS 609
- S3 Santo Domingo de Silos, Biblioteca del Monasterio MS 3
- S4 Santo Domingo de Silos, Biblioteca del Monasterio MS 4
- S5 Santo Domingo de Silos, Biblioteca del Monasterio MS 5
- S6 Santo Domingo de Silos, Biblioteca del Monasterio MS 6
- S7 Santo Domingo de Silos, Biblioteca del Monasterio MS 7
- T4 Toledo, Biblioteca Capitolare MS 35-4
- T5 Toledo, Biblioteca Capitolare MS 35-5

melodies in the extant manuscripts? They have argued that either the oral tradition must have become fixed before the point of writing, or notation existed earlier than previously thought.¹

The evidence of Old Hispanic chant has rarely been considered in this discourse, mainly because the pitch content cannot be reconstructed from the Visigothic neumes in which most of the chants are preserved.² This constraint has severely restricted engagement with the repertoire. The neumes, however, can tell us much about the melodies. In addition to showing melodic contour, the notation has an unusual variety of different neume shapes for each melodic outline. Very specific neume shapes often combine with a consistent use of the notation space to suggest the presence of recurring melodic formulas. On this basis, we have made close comparisons of individual chants and recurring neume patterns preserved in multiple manuscripts. With this breakthrough, we can integrate the Old Hispanic materials into the discourse about oral and written transmission. Kenneth Levy took steps in this direction, using Old Hispanic chant to explore aspects of the Gallican ‘pre-history’ of chant. While he argued that chants shared by the Old Hispanic, Franco-Roman, and Milanese traditions preserve some of the melodic characteristics of their Gallican predecessors, he rarely considered Old Hispanic chant on its own terms.³

In a brief introductory polemic, Don Randel asserted that the elaborate Old Hispanic melodies point not to an improvisatory process, but rather to a culture in which the fixing of individual melodies was of primary importance.⁴ In the present article, we test this hypothesis by examining different versions of Old Hispanic chants transmitted in manuscripts dating

¹ See further discussion below, pages 4-6 [000].

² Two dozen chants are preserved in Aquitanian neumes that show intervals; these have been edited in Casiano Rojo and Germán Prado, *El Canto Mozárabe* (Barcelona, 1929), 73-81.

³ Kenneth Levy, ‘Toledo Rome and the Legacy of Gaul’, *Early Music History*, 4 (1984), 49-99; ‘Old Hispanic Chant in Its European Context’, in Emilio Cásares Rodicio, Ismael Fernández de la Cuesta, and José López-Caló (eds), *España en la música de occidente: actas del congreso internacional celebrado en Salamanca, 29 de octubre-5 de noviembre de 1985* (Madrid, 1987), 3-14.

⁴ Don Randel, ‘The Old Hispanic Rite as Evidence for the Earliest Forms of the Western Christian Liturgies’, in *Actas del XV Congreso de la Sociedad Internacional de Musicología: culturas musicales del Mediterráneo y sus ramificaciones, Madrid/3-10/IV/1992* (Madrid, 1993), 491-96; at 493-4.

from the ninth to eleventh centuries.⁵ Setting aside speculation about the pre-notational state of the repertory, we assess which aspects of the notated tradition were fixed and which aspects allowed for flexibility, with implications for how oral and written processes may have interacted during the early centuries of notation. The Old Hispanic witnesses lack the melodic fixity often associated with the early Franco-Roman manuscripts (nearly all preserving the Mass rather than the Office).⁶ The culture in which the Old Hispanic chant was practised, moreover, lacked the rhetoric of correctness that surrounded the Franco-Roman liturgy. In these ways, the Old Hispanic chant contrasts with the Franco-Roman repertoire that has usually been the focus of chant scholarship, and it presents a new body of evidence through which to explore old questions.

Multiple versions of individual Old Hispanic chants form a key part of our evidence. Although this comparative methodology for studying melodic transmission is well established in Franco-Roman chant scholarship,⁷ the paucity of surviving material poses a unique challenge when engaging with the Old Hispanic materials. Some extant manuscripts are fragmentary and others, although complete, preserve only a limited portion of the liturgical year or a subset of the repertory. As a result, many surviving chants are unica, and it

⁵ Only small parts of the Old Hispanic repertory have received detailed melodic analysis. See Louis Brou, 'Le joyau des antiphonaires latins: le manuscrit 8 des Archives de la Cathédrale de León', *Archivos Leoneses*, 8 (1954), 7-114; idem, 'L'Alleluia dans la liturgie mozarabe. Étude liturgico-musicale d'après les manuscrits de chant', *Anuario musical*, 6 (1951), 3-90 at 32-5 and 44-9; Don Randel, 'Responsorial Psalmody in the Mozarabic Rite', *Études grégoriennes*, 10 (1989), 87-116; idem, *The Responsorial Psalm Tones for the Mozarabic Office* (Princeton, 1969); Nils Nadeau, "'Pro sonorum diversitate vel novitate": The Singing of Scripture in the Hispano-Visigothic Votive Masses' (Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1998); Susana Zapke, *El antifonario de San Juan de la Peña (siglos X-XI): estudio litúrgico-musical del rito hispano* (Zaragoza, 1995); Emma Hornby and Rebecca Maloy, *Music and Meaning in Old Hispanic Lenten Chants: Threni, Psalmi, and the Easter Vigil Canticles* (Woodbridge, 2013).

⁶ For counter-examples of office chants with abundant variants across the Franco-Roman repertoire, see, *inter alia*, Kate Helsen, 'The Great Responsories of the Divine Office - Aspects of Structure and Transmission' (Ph.D. diss., University of Regensburg, 2008); Daniel Saulnier, 'Des variantes musicales dans la tradition manuscrite des antiennes du répertoire romano-franc: Description, typologie, perspectives' (Ph.D. diss., École Pratique des hautes études, Paris, 2005).

⁷ See, *inter alia*, Andreas Pfisterer, *Cantilena Romana: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des gregorianischen Chorals* (Tübingen, 2002); Helsen, 'The Great Responsories'; David Hughes, 'Evidence for the Traditional View of the Transmission of Gregorian Chant', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 40 (1987), 377-404; and idem, 'The Implications of Variants for Chant Transmission', in Peter Kahn and Anne-Katrin Heimer (eds), *De Musica et Cantu. Studien zur Geschichte der Kirchenmusik und der Oper: Helmut Huckle zum 60. Geburtstag* (Hildesheim, 1993), 65-74.

is exceptional for a chant to be preserved in more than three manuscripts. Origin and provenance, moreover, remain conjectural for almost all of the manuscripts.

Despite these challenges, it is possible to establish that some passages of Old Hispanic chant are very stable from manuscript to manuscript, in choice of neume shapes and sometimes also in how the notational space is used. The existence of such passages implies the use of notated exemplars from at least the late ninth century, as we discuss below. In other passages, however, we find a striking degree of melodic flexibility. Some variants arise in particular formal contexts, such as chant openings and cadences. Some melodic variants--but by no means all -- align with regional melodic dialects.⁸ In some cases, notators seem to have chosen freely from a bounded vocabulary of recurring melodic shapes that could be brought into play in particular melodic contexts. Our evidence suggests that no single version of a chant had an authoritative status across the Iberian written tradition. In this way, Old Hispanic chant provides a direct witness to melodic flexibility that is lacking in the core Franco-Roman repertory.⁹ Whether the existing melodies emerged orally or were supported by notation from their inception, Old Hispanic chant yields evidence for a reconstructive process within a set of constraints, which can only be indirectly hypothesized in Franco-Roman chant.

ORAL AND WRITTEN TRANSMISSION IN THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF MEDIEVAL CHANT

In the last decades of the twentieth century, different theories were proposed to account for the transition between pre-notational and written transmission of Franco-Roman chant.¹⁰

Treitler and Huckle held that singers reconstructed chants in each performance according to a

⁸ Four Old Hispanic regional dialects were identified by Don Randel in *The Responsorial Psalm Tones*. See further discussion below, page 7 [000].

⁹ The Franco-Roman office melodies may have had more variety than the Mass, as suggested by the studies cited above (see note 5), but there are too few extant Franco-Roman office manuscripts from the ninth to eleventh centuries for this hypothesis to be testable.

¹⁰ Some of the most important contributions to the conversation were gathered together in Thomas Forrest Kelly (ed.), *Oral and Written Transmission in Chant* (Aldershot, 2009).

system of constraints such as text, mode, liturgical genre, and a vocabulary of stock musical motifs, phrases and strategies.¹¹ Others held that the stability witnessed in the manuscripts could not have been maintained within an oral culture. Levy, for example, argued that the core Franco-Roman melodies were largely fixed in writing in the ninth (or even eighth) century, and that the written fixity of the extant sources traces back to the existence of a notated archetype ca. 800, or even earlier.¹² In response, Treitler conceded that the stability of the written tradition may indeed have arisen through the copying of exemplars that bore the stamp of Carolingian authority.¹³ He maintained, though, that his hypothesis about the nature of the oral precursor to the notated chant tradition, as well as the continuation of oral tradition alongside written exemplars, did not depend on the notated tradition's level of melodic variation. Following his lead, some scholars have seen the use of melodic formulas as an imprint of oral culture on the written records, especially when shared melodic processes in cognate versions of chants are preserved in distinct chant repertoires.¹⁴ Levy explored 'close multiples', chants that circulate in the Franco-Roman, Old Hispanic, and Milanese traditions. He considered these chants to have Gallican ancestors and argued that the similar

¹¹ Leo Treitler, 'Homer and Gregory: The Transmission of Epic Poetry and Plainchant', *Musical Quarterly*, 60 (1974), 333-72; idem, 'The "Unwritten" and "Written Transmission" of Medieval Chant and the Startup of Musical Notation', *Journal of Musicology*, 10 (1992), 132-91; idem, 'Oral, Written and Literate Process in the Music of the Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 65 (1981), 471-91; idem, 'Orality and Literacy in the Music of the Middle Ages', *Paragon*, 2 (1984), 143-74. Many of Treitler's articles on this topic are revised and collected in *With Voice and Pen: Coming to know Medieval Song and How it was Made* (New York, 2003). Helmut Huckle, 'Towards a New Historical View of Gregorian Chant', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 33 (1980), 437-467; idem, 'Die Übergang von mündlicher zu schriftlicher Musiküberlieferung im Mittelalter', in Daniel Hertz and Bonnie Wade (eds), *International Musicological Society: Report, Berkeley 1977* (Kassel, 1981), 180-191; idem, 'Gregorianische Fragen', *Die Musikforschung*, 41 (1988), 304-330. Other scholarship exploring the use of formulas in genres of Franco-Roman chant through this oral-reconstructive lens includes Max Haas, *Mündliche Überlieferung und altrömischer Choral: Historische und analytische computergestützte Untersuchungen* (Bern, 1997); Helsen, 'The Great Responsories'; Emma Hornby, *Gregorian and Old Roman Eighth-Mode Tracts* (Aldershot, 2001); Theodore Karp, *Aspects of Orality and Formularity in Gregorian Chant* (Evanston, 1998); Rebecca Maloy, *Inside the Offertory: Aspects of Chronology and Transmission* (New York, 2010); Edward Nowacki, 'The Gregorian Office Antiphons and the Comparative Method', *Journal of Musicology*, 4 (1985), 243-75.

¹² Kenneth Levy, *Gregorian Chant and the Carolingians* (Princeton, 1999), 129, for his hypothesis of a notated archetype ca. 750.

¹³ Treitler, *With Voice and Pen*, 131-52.

¹⁴ See, for example, Helmut Huckle, 'Gregorianischer Gesang in altrömischer und fränkischer Überlieferung', *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*, 12 (1955), 74-87; idem, 'Die Übergang'; Edward Nowacki, 'Studies on the Office Antiphons of the Old Roman Manuscripts' (Ph.D. thesis, Brandeis University, 1980); Karp, *Aspects of Orality and Formularity*; see also scholars cited in footnote 11 (000), above.

melodic traits found in the extant versions predate his proposed Carolingian notated archetype, thus pointing to some degree of stability in the pre-Carolingian oral tradition.¹⁵

Others have attempted to reconcile the oral reconstructive model with the fixity of the written tradition by positing an intermediate stage between a flexible, oral-reconstructive tradition, and a largely fixed, notated one. David Hughes, for example, proposed that the written tradition was immediately preceded by an oral tradition consisting of fixed melodies, thus accounting for the close relationship between the written witnesses to Franco-Roman chant.¹⁶ Richard Crocker similarly posited a fixed 'inner text' that preceded the written record.¹⁷ Theodore Karp maintained that before notation, there were 'efforts at accurate rote memorization';¹⁸ and James McKinnon looked to the Franco-Roman melodies, first notated in the ninth century, for clues about the chants' seventh-century melodic state, with pre-notational fixity as an implicit assumption.¹⁹ Andreas Pfisterer also preferred the hypothesis of a broadly stable oral tradition preceding the written one, although he disagreed with the consensus view that the written tradition was fixed. Instead, he argued that the local variants found in the ninth- and early tenth-century manuscripts signal either that the written transmission did not eradicate existing local variation, or that such variation arose after notation began to be widespread.²⁰ For some, then, a chant's consistent written tradition might point to a fixed oral tradition that preceded the written one. Some see elements of oral-reconstructive processes that characterised the chant's pre-history, despite the consistent written tradition. Others have, by contrast, cautioned against using the notated evidence as the

¹⁵ Kenneth Levy, 'On Gregorian Orality', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 43 (1990), 1-30.

¹⁶ Hughes, 'Evidence for the Traditional View'; 'The Implications of Variants for Chant Transmission'; and 'Variants in Antiphon Families: Notation and Tradition,' in Marc Honegger and Paul Prévost (eds), *La Musique et le rite sacré et profane: actes du XIIIe congrès de la Société Internationale de Musicologie Strasbourg, 1982* (Strasbourg, 1985), 29-47.

¹⁷ Richard Crocker, 'Gregorian Studies in the Twenty-first Century', *Plain-song and Medieval Music*, 4 (1995), 33-86 at 63-5.

¹⁸ Karp, *Aspects of Orality and Formularity*, 34-5.

¹⁹ James McKinnon, *The Advent Project: The Later-Seventh Century Creation of the Roman Mass Proper* (Berkeley, 2000), 375-403.

²⁰ Pfisterer, *Cantilena Romana*, 30; 76; 178-93.

basis for speculation about its pre-written state. Some scholars attribute more importance to small melodic variants, and therefore reject the rhetoric of the “fixed written tradition” entirely. Because it is not possible to know which elements of the melodic substance emerged before notation and which were introduced as the melodies were written down, scholars have used similar evidence to support different views of what the early notated manuscripts can tell us.

HISTORIOGRAPHY OF OLD HISPANIC CHANT

The Old Hispanic liturgy came into being well before the earliest extant manuscripts. Much of its development is thought to be concentrated between 589 (when the Visigothic rulers converted from Arianism to Nicene Christianity), and the Islamic conquest of the Iberian Peninsula, which began in 711. In *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, written between 598 and 615, Isidore of Seville (d. 636) described a rite that is structurally similar to that of the later manuscripts.²¹ He also attributed chant composition to his brother, bishop Leander of Seville (d. 599).²² Later in the seventh century, Ildefonsus of Toledo credited chant creation to bishops such as John of Saragossa, Conantius of Palentia, Braulio of Saragossa and Eugenius of Toledo.²³ The Verona Orationale, usually dated before 732, comprises prayers that followed Old Hispanic office antiphons, alleluiatici and responsories, with marginal cues to

²¹ Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, ed. Christopher Lawson (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 113; Turnhout, 1989). The connections between Isidore’s descriptions and the existing manuscripts are summarized in many places, including Germán Prado, *Historia del rito mozárabe et Toledano* (Burgos, 1928), 13-17; Louis Brou, ‘Problèmes liturgiques chez Saint Isidore’, in Manuel Díaz y Díaz (ed.), *Isidoriana: Colección de estudios sobre Isidoro de Sevilla* (León, 1961), 193-209; Randel, ‘Responsorial Psalmody’; Jordi Pinell, *Liturgia Hispánica* (Barcelona, 1998), 108-111; Graham Woolfenden, *Daily Prayer in Christian Spain: A Study of the Mozarabic Office* (London, 2000), 3-4 and 62.

²² Isidore, *De viris illustribus*, ed. Carmen Codoñer Merino (Salamanca, 1964), 150.

²³ Ildefonsus, *De viris illustribus*, ed. Valeriano Yarza Urquiola, (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 114a; Turnhout, 2007), 607, 613, 612, and 614-15. On later attributions of chant to seventh-century figures, see Donatien De Bruyne, ‘De l’origine de quelques textes liturgiques mozarabes’, *Revue Bénédictine*, 30 (1913), 421-36.

the chant texts; almost the same set of chants is found in the later notated manuscripts.²⁴ For this reason, the bulk of the repertory is often assumed to have been in place before the early eighth century.

The earliest Old Hispanic sources with musical notation date to the late-ninth or early-tenth century. They do not bear witness to a single unified melodic tradition, but instead contain different melodic dialects. Indeed, Don Randel identified four regionally differentiated practices for the formulaic Old Hispanic responsory verse tones, based on comparison of the neume shapes and their implied melodic outlines.²⁵ Two of these traditions, Toledo A and Toledo B, are found in manuscripts associated with the city of Toledo, dating from the twelfth century onwards and are not under consideration in the present article. The other two traditions are preserved in manuscripts from the north of the peninsula. One is associated with the region around León,²⁶ and the other is found further east, labelled by Randel as the ‘Rioja’ dialect.²⁷ León and Rioja are the most closely related of the four regional traditions. They have seven related responsory verse tones, in which there are similar melodic outlines and parallel principles of construction. We have recently observed the same four melodic dialects in some Old Hispanic cadential and opening patterns.²⁸

²⁴ See, *inter alia*, W. S. Porter, ‘Studies in the Mozarabic Office’, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 35 (1934), 266-86; Louis Brou, ‘L’Antiphonaire wisigothique et l’antiphonaire gregorien du VIIe siècle’, *Anuario musical*, 5 (1950), 3-10; and idem, ‘Le joyau’, 11-13.

²⁵ Randel, *Responsorial Psalm Tones*.

²⁶ This is preserved in L8 (we follow Díaz y Díaz in preferring a dating to the first third of the 10th century, and a place of copying likely in the León region: Manuel Díaz y Díaz, ‘Some Incidental Notes on Music Manuscripts’, in *Hispania Vetus: Musical-liturgical Manuscripts from Visigothic Origins to the Franco-roman Transition (9th-12th centuries)*, ed. S. Zapke (Bilbao, 2007), 93-111); Sal (copied for Queen Sancha of León); Sant (copied for King Ferdinand I of León); the BN56 antiphoner fragment (from San Zoilo de Carrión, or perhaps the founding abbey, San Zoilo de Córdoba); and León F-5. Randel, *Responsorial Psalm Tones*, chapter 1, and 77-8.

²⁷ In *The Responsorial Psalm Tones*, Randel raises the possibility that this dialect—though not the manuscripts—could have its ultimate origin in Galicia, due to the influx of Galician immigrants, first into Eastern León, then into the Rioja.

²⁸ Emma Hornby and Rebecca Maloy, ‘Melodic dialects in Old Hispanic chant’, *Plainsong and Medieval Music*, 25 (2016), 37-72.

Susana Zapke has proposed a different classification of the Old Hispanic manuscripts, focusing on notational characteristics rather than melodies. She defines five ‘geopolitical spaces’: Catalonia, Aragon,²⁹ León-Castile, Navarre, and Toledo.³⁰ The Old Hispanic melodic dialects do not consistently correspond to these notational classifications: Zapke attributes some manuscripts preserving the ‘Rioja’ melodic tradition to León-Castile and others to Navarre;³¹ other manuscripts in Zapke’s León-Castile group preserve the León melodic tradition; and Zapke’s single grouping of Toledo manuscripts – cogent on notational grounds – encompasses two distinct melodic and liturgical traditions. Here, because our primary concern is melodic transmission, we build on Randel’s four dialects rather than on Zapke’s notationally-based classification.

THE WRITTEN TRADITION OF OLD HISPANIC CHANT

Since Old Hispanic chant is thought to have developed in the seventh century, it is likely to have originated in a pre-notational culture. Notations of the kind found in the Iberian manuscripts are not thought to predate the time of Charlemagne (d. 814).³² Certain

²⁹ Visigothic notation was used to preserve the Roman rite in both Catalonia and Aragon; there are no extant manuscripts from these regions preserving the Old Hispanic rite. The Catalan fragments Tarragona, Archivo Histórico Archidiocesano, Fragmento 22/1 and Montserrat, Biblioteca de la Abadía contain the Franco-Roman rite, as Zapke acknowledges in ‘Coexistencia de signos y funciones en la cultura visigótica escrita: notas marginales’, *Études grégoriennes* 40 (2013), 283-91; 287. Elsewhere, however, she claims that these are ‘the two oldest liturgical-musical specimens of the Hispanic rite’. See ‘Coexistencia de signos’, 284, and ‘Dating Neumes According to their Morphology: The Corpus of Toledo’, in *The Calligraphy of Medieval Music*, ed. John Haines (Turnhout, 2011), 91–9; at 91 n. 3.

³⁰ Susana Zapke, ‘Notation Systems in the Iberian Peninsula: From Spanish Notations to Aquitanian Notation (9th–12th Centuries)’, in *Hispania Vetustas*, 189–242, at 192.

³¹ The manuscripts in Randel’s ‘Rioja’ melodic dialect that Zapke attributes to Navarre, drawing on the work of Ruiz Asencio, ‘Códices pirenaicos y riojanos en la biblioteca de Silos en el siglo XI’, in *Silos. Un Milenio. Actas del Congreso Internacional sobre la Abadía de Santo Domingo de Silos II Historia* (Silos, 2003), 177-210, are: M-418, S3, S6, and S7. The manuscripts in Randel’s ‘Rioja’ melodic dialect, but in Zapke’s Castile-León region include: A30 and A56 (both likely copied at and for San Millán de la Cogolla), BL51, S3, S4 (Collins associates the manuscript with San Millán de la Cogolla: ‘Continuity and Loss in Medieval Spanish Culture’, in R. Collins and A. Goodman (eds), *Medieval Spain: Culture, Conflict and Coexistence* (Basingstoke and New York, 2002), 1-22), and S5. See Zapke, ‘Notation Systems,’ 198-9.

³² The Old Hispanic notation falls within the family of ‘Frankish’ neumes, broadly defined, that was used across much of western Europe. There are introductions to the Old Hispanic notation in, *inter alia*, Gregorio Maria Suñol, *Introducción a la paleografía musical gregoriana* (Montserrat 1925), 198-219; Casiano Rojo and Germán Prado, *El canto mozárabe* (Barcelona, 1929); Michel Huglo, ‘La notation wisigothique: est-elle plus ancienne que les autres notations européens?’, in *España en la música de Occidente*, 19-26; Solange Corbin, *Die Neumen*

characteristics of the existing Old Hispanic chants, however, clearly situate them in a literate culture. Some passages have almost neume-for-neume identity between different manuscripts, with the notational space also being used in a very similar way.

Ex. 1, a passage from the sacrificium (offertory) *Regnabit*, illustrates typical similarities and differences, and suggests specific literate practices lying behind the notations. The two manuscripts, L8 and A30, have identical neume forms over ‘dicit’, on most of ‘erit’, and on ‘quasi’, and they share other notational similarities, such as the gentle upward slope of the puncta on ‘dominus’ and parallel relative heightening of the puncta on ‘erit quasi’. In some cases, these are widespread notational conventions, present across many chants and manuscripts (the material on ‘dicit’, is discussed in Ex. 3, below, and the regionally-specific cadential pattern that follows on ‘dominus’ is discussed on pages 15-16 [000]). Either these melodic shapes were so distinctive that they were independently given identical notation by different scribes, or, more likely, there was a common written exemplar from which the extant notated versions derive.³³ Certain notational and melodic variants, however, suggest that the exemplars were not copied mechanically. The melisma on ‘pater’ (syllable 11), for

(Palaeographie der Musik, 1/3; Cologne 1977), Herminio González Barrionuevo, ‘Relación entre la notación “mozárabe” de tipo vertical y otras escrituras neumáticas’, *Studi gregoriani*, 11 (1995), 5-112; idem, ‘Algunos rasgos fundamentales de la notación “mozárabe” del norte’, *Revista de Musicología*, 20 (1997), 38-49; Nancy Philips, ‘Notationen und Notationslehren von Boethius bis zum 12. Jahrhundert’, in Thomas Ertelt and Frieder Zaminer (eds), *Geschichte der Musiktheorie, vol. 4: Die Lehre vom einstimmigen liturgischen Gesang* (Darmstadt, 2000), 293-623; 171-77; González Barrionuevo, ‘La notación del antifonario de León’, in Ismael Fernández de la Cuesta, Rosario Álvarez Martínez and Ana Llorens Martín (eds), *El canto mozárabe y su entorno: Estudios sobre la música de la liturgia viejo hispánica* (Madrid, 2013), 95-120. Many of these studies are incorporated into Hornby and Maloy, *Music and Meaning*, 315-26. One of the first extant Franco-Roman manuscripts with notation is the fragment of a West Frankish office Antiphoner notated in Breton neumes, Oxford, Bodleian, Auct. F.IV.26, dated to the second quarter of the ninth century by Bernhard Bischoff in his *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)*, Teil II: *Laon-Paderborn* (Wiesbaden, 2004), no. 3773. For Levy, this kind of neuming dates from ca. 800: ‘Charlemagne’s Archetype of Gregorian Chant’, *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 40 (1987), 1-30.

³³ These two different interpretations of graphic similarities were a major point of contention in the debates between Levy and Treitler. See Kenneth Levy, ‘Charlemagne’s Archetype’, 12-15; and Treitler, ‘Communication’, *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 41 (1988), 566-75. In these publications, however, Treitler’s claim that such graphic similarities could be arrived at independently was stated in a rather limited context.

example, opens with different forms of a two-note falling figure in the two manuscripts.³⁴

Although both neumes have an angular connection between the upwards and (shorter) downwards strokes, the relative lengths and angles of the strokes are different. It is unclear whether this variant is simply graphic, or whether it represents a different performative nuance. This is followed by a melodic variant: the next neumatic sign in A30 is looped near its base (indicating NHH)³⁵ and angular in L8 (indicating NH). This melisma occurs elsewhere in the repertory, usually with the looped sign indicating NHH; the version with an angular sign indicating NH is very rare.³⁶

Similar phenomena may be seen in Ex. 2, which shows the extant versions of the first verse of the *sono Verba mea*, preserved in PB99,³⁷ L8, BL51, and S6. In comparing the aligned notations, we have observed four different types of relationship, which will be considered in turn: i) identical neumatic signs, ii) functionally equivalent but different signs, iii) variant signs implying melodic nuance, and iv) differing graphic means of representing relative pitch. One striking notational parallel is on syllable 8, where PB99, L8 and S6 have identical neumes; the same may be seen on syllable 7 in L8 and S6. In L8, the second neume is placed directly above the first; the other manuscripts (which have less vertical space for notation) place the second neume to the right of the first.³⁸ On some syllables, the neumes are

³⁴ In our analyses we label the components of neumes N (for an unknown or neutral note), H (higher than the previous note), S (same as the previous note), and L (lower than the previous note). + marks the division between syllables, and - indicates a neume break within a syllable.

³⁵ On interpretation of this looped penstroke as a three-note rise, see Herminio González Barrionuevo, 'La grafía del "salicus" en la notación "mozárabe" de tipo vertical', *Revista de Musicología*, 12 (1989), 397-410.

³⁶ Apart from this chant, we have encountered it only in the unicum responsory *Peccabimus* and the sacrificium *Aedificavit Abraham altare*, which is not notated in any other ninth- to eleventh-century manuscripts.

³⁷ Fragmentary antiphoner, late-9th or early-10th century; origin unknown.

³⁸ See also syllable 13. Here, PB99, L8 and S6 share a v-shaped NH (partially obscured by a lacuna in PB99), an angular NH, and a NLH with similar proportions in each manuscript. The final neume of the melisma comprises two pen strokes that function together as a single sign in L8 (see González Barrionuevo, 'Relación entre la notación "mozárabe" de tipo vertical y otras escrituras neumáticas', *Studi Gregoriani* 11 (1995), 5-112; 68-71). The first of these two penstrokes in PB99 and S6 is inclined very differently. This is their standard neume combination when L8 has the rounded NSH combination found here. It remains uncertain whether the two penstrokes combine here to signal NL-NH (i.e., there is a melodic variant), or whether – despite the inclination – the two penstrokes combine to signal NSH, as in L8. However, this is a commonly used formula (on which, see discussion of "Formula A", below) which, in this textual context, uniformly includes the rounded NSH ending

functionally equivalent but formed slightly differently. At syllable 6 in all four manuscripts, the melodic outline NHLL is notated. This is formed of neat angular steps in L8, but of steps placed more diagonally in BL51, a much rougher falling scribble in PB99,³⁹ and falling waves in S6. In each case, one can deduce that the neume indicates the same melodic contour. Although the scribes have different techniques (angled step shapes, or more curved patterns), all are using the gestural principles of this notation type to signal multiple falling notes within a single penstroke. Similarly, at syllable 3, S6, PB99 and L8 represent the initial two-note rise with two separate penstrokes, whereas BL51 uses a single penstroke, a v-shaped NH. In all four manuscripts, this is followed by a sign representing NHL. PB99, BL51 and L8 have similar shapes, whereas S6 has an extra small curved shape at the end of the neume; this shape seems in some way to nuance the meaning of the NHL neume rather than adding another note. Some variants in neume choice, by contrast, may signal different melodic nuances; for example, in BL51 on syllables 7 and 8, the looped rise has been considered by scholars to indicate a salicus.⁴⁰ While the meaning of the salicus is still disputed, it is thought to imply some distinctive attribute of the second note and, thus, the looped rise was aurally differentiated in some way from the simple three note rise found in the other manuscripts at this point. Other graphic variants suggest a different way to show relative pitch. At syllables 1 and 11, for example, all manuscripts have a single note. BL 51, however, has a virga (upward stroke), used explicitly to signal a high or higher note, whereas the other manuscripts have the punctum (horizontal stroke). Rather than pointing to a melodic variant, BL 51 may simply contain more melodic information than the other manuscripts.⁴¹

in L8, suggesting that it is a graphical variant as a result of differing scribal practice, rather than a melodic variant.

³⁹ One scribe in L8, responsible only for folios 36v-40r, has a similarly undisciplined version of this penstroke. The musical scribes of L8 will be systematically identified by Elsa De Luca in forthcoming publications.

⁴⁰ see footnote 36.

⁴¹ It is also notable that the melisma on syllable 15 shows both melodic and notational variants, but with similar neume groupings (see the numbered boxes in Ex. 2, syllable 15). Further, in syllable 15 neumes 3-5, only L8 differs from the others, using the curved rather than straight pair of unison notes.

The melodic variants between these four manuscripts, summarised in Table 1, show that while Old Hispanic melodies are characteristically broadly consistent, there are variants at a detailed level. Not all of these melodic variants correlate with Randel's regional melodic traditions. In Randel's grouping, BL51, PB99, and this part of S6 align with the 'Rioja' tradition.⁴² As shown in Table 1, the variants on syllable 5 align with the grouping of manuscripts according to the Rioja and León melodic dialects, but the other variants in the table do not. In Examples 1 and 2, representative of much of the tradition, some passages are notationally identical, probably pointing to the use of written exemplars. Some passages have equivalent melodic outlines with different neume shapes, and others have small melodic variants. Such small variants need not reflect copying errors. It is possible that they instead reflect the scribes' internalised sense of the melody, which could vary by region or by institution.⁴³ Certainly, these types of variants remind us that exemplars were used critically. The scribes seem to have closely followed the neume shapes of passages whose melodic contour and interpretation matched with their own understanding of the melody, but departed from the exemplar when it contradicted their melodic understanding.

[INSERT Table 1]

VARIANTS IN THE USE OF MELODIC FORMULAS

As far as can be determined, the Old Hispanic repertory contains very few chants that are based on type melodies, in the manner of the Franco-Roman tracts or graduals.⁴⁴ The whole corpus, however, is characterized by the use of recurring material in given formal contexts.

⁴² The two dialects in S6 are associated with different scribes within the parchment portion of the manuscript. See Randel, *Responsorial Psalm Tones*, 75-76.

⁴³ On such internalised sense of melody, see Susan Rankin, 'Calligraphy and the Study of Neumatic Notations', in John Haines (ed.), *The Calligraphy of Medieval Music* (Turnhout, 2011), 47-62 at 48, and 'On the Treatment of Pitch in Early Music Writing', *Early Music History*, 30 (2011), 105-75 at 151-52.

⁴⁴ On such Franco-Roman type melodies, see the extensive literature on tracts, including Hornby, *Gregorian and Old Roman Eighth-Mode Tracts*; idem, *Western Liturgical Chant and Patristic Exegesis* (Woodbridge, 2009); Xaver Kainzbauer, *Der Tractus tetrardus: Eine centologische Untersuchung* (Beiträge zur Gregorianik, 11; Regensburg, 1991); Karp, *Aspects of Orality and Formularity*; Edward Nowacki, 'Text Declamation as a Determinant of Melodic Form in the Old Roman Eighth-Mode Tracts', *Early Music History*, 6 (1986), 193-226.

Such recurring patterns become recognisable when they comprise two or more neumes, used consistently in terms of placement in the notational space and syllable underlay. A large but bounded series of melodic shapes, for example, serves as cadences, almost always marking the end of a verbal unit and musical phrase. These shapes occur both at major textual divisions, such as the end of a chant or complete sentence, and at minor divisions, coming, for example, before or after prepositional phrases or relative clauses. Minor divisions may also fall after the opening word or two of a chant, or at an introduction to direct speech.

One of these cadential shapes is a short melisma we shall call ‘Formula A’. This neume pattern is extremely common across genres and appears in almost all extant ninth- to eleventh-century manuscripts,⁴⁵ on the penultimate or antepenultimate syllable of a phrase.⁴⁶ As shown in Example 3a, Formula A has certain distinctive notational features that make it instantly recognizable on a given folio. In most ninth- to eleventh-century manuscripts, the small v-shaped NH precedes a larger square NH, which is usually placed above it; the placement of the following NLH can vary, being either to the right of the preceding NH or vertically above it. It is unclear whether these ways of positioning the neumes reflect pitch content (are ‘iconic’ in Treitler’s sense), or whether they are merely a notational convention.⁴⁷ In the responsories, the vertical placement and the side-by-side placement are

⁴⁵ For example, of the 521 responsories preserved in one or more ninth- to eleventh-century manuscripts, this precise combination of neumes appears 283 times in 155 chants (that is, in 30% of the responsories). No particular importance should be attached to the manuscripts which do not contain the formula, all of which are fragments: León F-5 (which preserves only one chant); Silos fragment 26 and the binding fragments in Silos 1 (late-ninth or early-tenth century; unknown origin); Lamego (a single leaf of a 10th or 11th century *Liber mysticus*, unknown origin); BL44 (whose fragmentary late-ninth or early-tenth century *Liber canticorum* preserves only four folios of cantic antiphons); and BL52 (an Orational which preserves partially notated incipits for some office chants; these incipits may be late 10th century).

⁴⁶ In the responsories, Formula A occurs 139 times on the penultimate syllable, and 132 times on the antepenultimate syllable of the phrase. On the antepenultimate syllable, it is more closely associated with major text divisions. At the end of a chant or sentence, it occurs 86 times on the antepenultimate syllable and 32 on the penultimate syllable. At the ends of smaller units, it occurs 106 times on the penultimate syllable and 46 times on the antepenultimate syllable. Formula A is also strongly associated with paroxytonic endings. In the responsories, only 16 instances are proparoxytonic.

⁴⁷ For an analysis of similar notational conventions in St. Gallen 359, see Susan Rankin, ‘On the Treatment of Pitch’, 147-48. On the v-shaped NH, see González Barrionuevo, ‘El pes corto en “uve”’, which also summarizes previous views on the meaning of this shape. González Barrionuevo has shown that, at least in the Franco-Roman melodies in London, British Library, Add. MS 30850, the neume signifies an interval of a second or

equally likely to appear at minor textual divisions.⁴⁸ At major divisions, by contrast, the side-by-side placement appears twice as often as the vertical placement.⁴⁹ In fact, major text divisions show a clear preference for the side-by-side placement across all ninth- to eleventh-century manuscripts. In summary, this neume combination is strongly associated with major or minor text divisions: only 7% of instances (20 of 283) in the responsories from the ninth- to eleventh-century manuscripts do not appear at a logical textual dividing point. Although we cannot prove that it always represents the same pitch content, this particular combination almost always marks the approaching end of a textual unit and musical phrase.

FLEXIBILITY WITHIN PARTICULAR FORMAL CONTEXTS

Despite the ubiquity of Formula A, there is a certain degree of flexibility in its use, as illustrated in Example 3b and Table 2. In the responsories, there are 101 occasions where Formula A appears in a chant preserved in two or more ninth- to eleventh-century manuscripts. In third of these of these cases (32 of 101), another manuscript uses a neume combination other than Formula A in the same context. In the sacrificia, just over a third (10/27) of chants using Formula A that are preserved in more than one ninth- to eleventh-century manuscript have another neume combination in another manuscript.

[INSERT Table 2]

third (major or minor) in the great majority of cases, and, in rare cases, a fourth. When used in combination with other neumes, it often represents a lower point in the melody.

⁴⁸ End of a clause: 37 with vertical placement; 37 with side-by-side placement.

Before or after a prepositional phrase or relative clause: 20 with vertical placement; 21 with side-by-side placement. In the middle of a textual unit, where one would not expect a division: 9 with vertical placement; 11 with side-by-side placement.

⁴⁹ End of a chant: 20 with vertical placement; 55 with side-by-side placement. End of a sentence: 12 with vertical placement; 39 with side-by-side placement. After an introduction to direct speech (a frequent moment for a rhetorically charged pause in Old Hispanic chant): 4 with vertical placement; 8 with side-by-side placement. At a chant opening, after the first word or two words (where one frequently encounters cadential gestures, regardless of text syntax): 3 with vertical placement; 7 with side-by-side placement.

When a manuscript does not use Formula A at the point in question, a variety of shapes appear instead, as shown in Example 3b. Sometimes the manuscript without Formula A uses a similar shape but one that does not seem to be a formula (Ex. 3b, row 1).⁵⁰ In other cases, the manuscript without Formula A has a completely different shape, with an equivalent cadential function, such as a single note (Ex. 3b, row 2) or another formulaic cadence shape (Ex. 3b, row 3;⁵¹ Ex. 3b, row 4). Some alternatives to Formula A recur multiple times. In the responsories in the ninth- to eleventh-century manuscripts, for example, NH-NLH and NHH-NH-NLH each appear four times as alternatives to Formula A.⁵²

These patterns suggest something about the compositional process of the Old Hispanic chant. Melodic shapes such as Formula A were part of a standard vocabulary of different gestures that could be called upon to mark a musical dividing point. Although the melodic contours of these gestures can be very different, they are functionally equivalent and sometimes treated as being interchangeable. Such variants could not arise through a slip of the eye, ear, or quill. Instead, it seems that Formula A was understood as being suitable for particular structural points in certain melodies, and scribes could also select equally valid alternatives.

We find a similar phenomenon at the openings of chants: standard melodic material and variance in its use. On fo. 278r of L8 (Ex. 4), a page selected at random, the openings of each chant and verse illustrate the extent to which the openings recur (Table 3): sometimes just once (Table 3, box 6), sometimes up to a dozen or so times (boxes 1, 2, 4 and 9), and sometimes more often (boxes 3, 5 and 7). It is unusual to encounter a chant or verse opening

⁵⁰ The shapes used here in A30 are unique among the responsories as an alternative to Formula A.

⁵¹ L8, for example, has this alternative contour on the penultimate syllable at syntactical breaks in the *sacrificia* *Sacrificium deo* ('studete'), *Ego dominus* ('eos'), *Fulgebit* ('testamenti'), and *Iustitiae* ('meum').

⁵² NH-NLH: *Amen amen dico vobis quia qui verbum* 'morte ad' in S7 where BL51 has Formula A; *Qui diligit me diligitur* 'diligam' in L8 where A30 has formula A, and vice versa in *Stephanus vidit caelos* 'tuis'; and *Venite benedicti* 'mei' in L8 where A30 and BL51 have formula A.

NHH-NH-NLH: *Dominus de Syna veniet alleluia* 'alleluia' in L8, where BL45 has Formula A, and vice versa in *Ego elegi vos* 'Ego'; in L8 in *Sancti qui certamen* 'dicentes' and 'non' where S3 has Formula A.

whose neume patterns never recur elsewhere in the repertoire (box 8). With the exception of one psalmus, then, this randomly selected page from L8 consists of chants and verses whose opening neume combinations appear elsewhere in the repertoire. Like the cadential context in which formula A can occur, these chant and section openings can be filled from a large but apparently bounded melodic vocabulary.

[INSERT Ex. 4] [INSERT Table 3]

Like formula A, the opening materials exhibit some flexibility. The NHH+NL opening shape encountered in L8 (Ex. 4, boxes 1 and 2) appears in ten cognate chants in other manuscripts. On five occasions when L8 has this particular NHH+NL opening, however, another ninth- to eleventh-century manuscript has a different neuming. Once, this simply comprises a different NL shape;⁵³ the other four occasions, however, demonstrate a slightly different understanding of the melodic outline. Both alternative shapes recur in other chant openings, suggesting that they too were a known melodic shape that could fit into the same formal slot as the NHH+NL shape.⁵⁴ In such examples, the variants between manuscripts should not be understood as random “noise” in the transmission of the melodies. Instead, they suggest that the chants were understood not as completely fixed melodies, but as incorporating a vocabulary of melodic shapes that could be fitted into particular formal contexts with some flexibility.

One cadential context furnishes a striking instance of this. In responsories and sacrificia, L8, Sant, and Sal (all preserving the León melodic dialect) share a particular response to three-syllable proparoxytones at the ends of phrases, especially on the word ‘domin-’.⁵⁵ In this cadential pattern, the final three syllables of the phrase have NH+NL+N or

⁵³ A30 has the same melodic outline but an angular rather than a rounded NL on fo. 204.

⁵⁴ A30 has NH rather than NHH twice (fo. 126^r and fo. 100^v). Undifferentiated puncta N+N are used where L8 has NHH+NL in A56 (fo. 48^v) and BL51 (fo. 200^v).

⁵⁵ It appears either on proparoxytones or where the phrase ends with a monosyllable, treated enclitically in combination with the previous word (such enclitic treatment of monosyllables is also very common in Franco-Roman chant). The responsories, for example, have six instances of a paroxytonic cadence of this type, and 156

NH+NL+NH (Ex. 5, syllables 4-6, L8; see also Ex. 4, box 11).⁵⁶ As Table 4 illustrates, this cadence is very commonly used in the sacrificia and responsories of the León melodic dialect. Manuscripts within the ‘Rioja’ dialect, however, typically have an alternative cadence here, with the shape N+NHL+N/NH (see Ex. 5, syllables 4-6, M-418). In the responsories, this N+NHL+N cadence is found in the ‘Rioja’ manuscripts in 72/83 of instances where the León manuscripts have NH+NL+N. Thus, while the NH+NL+N cadence was known in the ‘Rioja’ dialect, it was not the typical choice. The two cadential shapes (NH+NL+N and N+NHL+N) were understood as functionally equivalent in some sense, since both appear in both dialects, but the dialects have very different preferences.

[INSERT Ex. 5] [INSERT Table 4]

The ‘Rioja’ preference for NHL on the penultimate syllable of internal cadences is also seen in a category of cadences where the antepenultimate syllable has a single note or ends with a descent (see Ex. 1, “dominus”, A30). In the sacrificia, the León dialect manuscripts usually have NHH on the penultimate syllable in this context, with the distinctive neume shape seen in L8 in Ex. 1, “(do)mi(nus)” (219 of 250 cases; Table 5), and the NHL version appears only three times. The ‘Rioja’ dialect manuscripts, by contrast, have the NHL version in 55 of 113 cases, whereas the NHH version appears only 15 times. Thus, a shared repertoire of neume shapes appropriate to this formal and textual context was known across the two melodic dialects under discussion. However, as with the ‘domin-’ cadence type discussed above, each melodic dialect has a distinct preference.

[INSERT Table 5]

Substantial variants in long melismas

instances of proparoxytonic ones (including 77 on ‘domin-’): in this genre, this cadence type falls on a proparoxytone 97% of the time. By contrast, the tendency for this cadential shape to be associated with particular accents does not translate to the ferial antiphons, where it occurs 42 times on paroxytones and 41 times on proparoxytones (including 16 on ‘domin-’).

⁵⁶ The first NH is always either angular, either v-shaped or square, and the NL is always rounded. NH+NL+NSH is a rare version of the cadence, whose use is noted in Table 4.

Another context in which we find melodic flexibility is in the long melismas of the *soni* and *sacrificia*. Some of these melismas show an almost note-for-note correspondence between manuscripts,⁵⁷ but others have markedly variant traditions. Some of the *soni* survive in the fragmentary PB99, presently considered one of the earliest Old Hispanic witnesses, as well as in the tenth-century L8, thus providing a basis for comparison between the earliest manuscripts.

Ex. 6 shows the melismas on ‘clamorem eum/meum’ and ‘deus meus’ in verse 2 of the *sono Verba mea*, whose first verse was discussed above (Ex. 2). At ‘clamorem eum/meum’, PB99 has a lacuna, but the other three manuscripts have melismas that vary in length, melodic shape, and structure. Each melisma can be divided into constituent parts, according to its repeat structure. The neumes of melisma segment A (see Ex. 6a) are closely related in L8 and BL51, with the first four neumes being exactly equivalent. S6 is also related, although with two fewer neumes. All three versions end the segment with a rise then NS(N)HL. In melisma segment B, all three manuscripts have a rise and then NSL at the beginning of the segment; L8 and BL51 also both have NSLHL, but L8 continues with more notes. While segment B is repeated exactly in L8 and BL51, the end of the S6 version is different in its two neumings. Melisma segment C appears only in L8, and the three manuscripts each end the melisma in different ways. The notational similarities suggest that there was a shared core of material for the A and B sections, which was differently expanded to form the melisma preserved in each manuscript.

The next melisma, at ‘deus meus’ (ex.6b), shows even more variance. L8 and BL51 have long melismas that appear to be related. Segment A is shorter in L8, but four of the neumes are direct equivalents (the opening NHH and then the last three). Segment B starts and finishes with the same melodic outline, although it is not identical in the two

⁵⁷ Examples may be found in the *soni* *Alleluia exultabunt sancti* (L8 and A30); *Alleluia in matutinis* (L8, S3, and S6); *Alleluia in omnem terram* (L8 and BL45); *Alleluia iusticia plena est* (L8 and A30); and *Alleluia paratum cor meum* (L8 and A30), to name but a few.

manuscripts. Segment C ends in the same way in the two manuscripts, and both have a NSL neume twice in the middle of the segment, but they otherwise have independent melodic shapes. BL51's segment C (Ex. 6b) has contours similar to its B segment in the previous melisma (Ex. 6a). L8 lacks any discernible repetition between the two melismas. PB99 has only a version of melisma segment A; S6 has only three neumes. In both cases, these neumings may represent versions of the chant without a long melisma at this point, or may instead be a partial notation for a longer melisma that was carried by memory.

The major variants in these melismas do not always coincide with the melodic dialects Randel established. As noted, L8 belongs to the León tradition, and PB99, BL51, and this part of S6 to Rioja. In Ex. 6a, while all three versions are substantially different, S6 and BL51 have more in common with each other than with L8. In Ex. 6b, however, L8 and BL51, from different melodic dialects, are far more alike than either is to PB99 or S6.

Other longer melismas in the *soni* appear to have completely independent melodic traditions, as exemplified by the *sono Custodi me domine* (Ex. 7). Here, the first two neumes of melisma segment A are shared between L8 and PB99, but PB99 has only one further neume in the melisma. L8 repeats segment A, then has two further segments followed by a closing section. S6 has just melisma segment A, with a varied repeat (A' in Ex. 7). This version shares only the NSL neume with L8 and PB99.

In short, some *sono* melismas are notated in very similar ways in multiple manuscripts, others share a common core that is expanded or elaborated in some manuscripts in different ways, and still others have completely independent melodies. We cannot tell whether the short melismas seen, for example, in PB99 and S6 in Exx. 6b and 7 signal a less florid singing practice, or whether they are abbreviated notations for longer melismas. One possibility is that most passages of the melodies in the ninth- to eleventh centuries were stable in transmission, but that in particular contexts scribes could either insert or omit large

melismas at their discretion, or expand or abbreviate existing melismas. This would constitute a parallel to added melismas in Franco-Roman chant, first attested by Amalarius of Metz in the ninth century, but not witnessed in manuscripts until the late tenth and early eleventh centuries.⁵⁸ The variant forms of the long melismas provide evidence of continuing creative activity in the 9th to 11th century and show us another context in which the Old Hispanic tradition was flexible.

FLEXIBILITY IN THE NOTATION OR PERFORMANCE OF INDIVIDUAL CHANTS

Thus far, we have shown that despite the generally high degree of fixity in Old Hispanic chant, the manuscripts show flexibility in certain contexts, such as openings, cadences, and long melismas. These examples indicate that there was not a single authoritative version known across the Iberian Peninsula. Exceptionally, we also find evidence of melodic variation within a single chant in a single manuscript. In the Good Friday psalmus *Deus deus meus* (Example 8), the same formulaic melody, repeated across all 16 verses, preserves two distinct understandings of a single melody. In this case, a neumatic passage consists in verses one to nine of alternating NH and NL, with NH on the first accent (verses 3-9 are included in Ex. 8, boxes marked “A”). In verses ten to sixteen (boxes marked “B”), the passage instead consists of a single note on each syllable, sometimes with a curved NH on one syllable, usually an accented one. The melisma following this syllabic passage also begins differently in the two halves of the chant. This particular phenomenon is extremely rare: there are few chants whose melodies repeat mechanically for multiple verses in this way, and we do not know of any others with such a striking change of melodic shape mid-way through. This notation may be a literal record of a particular understanding of the chant, with a shift of treatment of the formulaic melody halfway through. Alternatively, two different scribal or

⁵⁸ Thomas Forrest Kelly, ‘Neuma triplex’, *Acta Musicologica* 60 (1988), 1-30 describes the earliest manuscript evidence.

cantorial understandings may have been conflated on the single folio, either providing a model for a single performance (with the melodic shift), or providing alternatives for different performances. Further, it could be that a scribal mistake in verse 10 was mechanically repeated for the remaining verses – duly adapted to accent and syllable count – and never corrected. In the absence of other early notations of this chant, there is no way of eliminating any of these possibilities. If verse 10 is not a scribal mistake, however, it suggests that even a formulaic melody repeated multiple times in a row could be sung or notated in different ways, either within a performance or within the scribes’ or singers’ understandings of how it should go.

[INSERT Ex. 8]

The responsory *Haec dicit dominus dilectione* offers further evidence that different versions of a melody could be known to one group of people. In L8, this chant is written twice in immediate succession on a single folio (see Ex. 9), within a list of six *ad matutinum* responsories for feasts of Virgins, from which cantors could apparently select at will. The six chants would not all have been sung on any given occasion. In Ex. 9, passages with identical neumes are left without annotations; places where the same melodic contour may be discerned but where the neume shapes are different are given a box with dotted lines; places where the two versions vary by just one note are given a box with dashed lines; and passages with a greater concentration of variants are given a box with a solid line. Differences are also evident in the formulaic verse tones (beginning ‘recordatus sum’). Both verses use Randel’s Tone A, but with a quite different understanding of how the formulaic melody should be assigned to the (identical) text.⁵⁹ This example shows that more than one version of a chant

⁵⁹ On this tone, and the degree to which it can vary in different chants, see Randel, *The Responsorial Psalm Tones*, 13-25. The verses are assigned to Tone A on p. 190.

could be known to a single institution, both being of sufficient interest to be written down. We do not know why the scribe wrote two different versions of the melody. Perhaps cantors could choose freely between them, or perhaps a cantor came across a second version of the melody and notated it for purposes of comparison. Alternatively, perhaps one of the versions was an attempt at improving the existing melody, or perhaps this example hints that there were further performance options, beyond what is preserved in the written record. In any case, this example shows that there is sufficient flexibility within the Old Hispanic tradition that two different versions of the same chant could be notated within a single manuscript on a single folio. The cantors were aware of the possibility of variation within their melodic tradition.

[INSERT Ex. 9]

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

As the foregoing examples have shown, the Old Hispanic chant exhibits a unique blend of fixity and flexibility. Points of close graphic similarity, such as those in Examples 1 and 2, attest to a reliance on writing and a probable use of exemplars. In the same examples, however, we observed small melodic variants, as well as notational differences. It is possible that these were introduced solely through copying, either by the use of multiple exemplars or by simple errors. It is more probable, however, that they reflect scribes' subtly different understandings of the melodies. By definition, the unpitched notation relies on an internalized, aural sense of the melody. As Susan Rankin has recently written, 'in "copying" something notated, an early medieval scribe needed to recall the melody in his own head, and then, to balance this inner knowledge with and against any written exemplar he used.'⁶⁰ While the variants between manuscripts cannot speak to the state of the oral tradition before

⁶⁰ Rankin, 'Calligraphy and the Study of Neumatic Notations,' 48.

notation began to be used, they suggest that during the ninth to eleventh centuries, the oral tradition that co-existed with notation was consistent in many aspects, but not uniform.

Despite the broad consistency of the melodic tradition, the sources exhibit variance in their use of standard material. As shown in Examples 3-6, certain structural points in the melodic syntax, such as openings and cadences, could be accommodated with a variety of different melodic shapes, each evidently considered valid by knowledgeable practitioners. Aspects of these examples bring to mind Treitler's concept of 'thrift', in which certain melodic functions, such as the opening or a closing of a clause, were supplied with standard formulas. The differences we observed in the use of formulas are also consistent with the reconstructive aspect of Treitler's thought: they suggest that at some point in the tradition, a fixed knowledge of individual melodies was combined with a knowledge of how to construct a melody. Because the Old Hispanic sources are more varied melodically than the earliest Franco-Roman ones, they give a more direct picture of how such a reconstructive process may have worked.

Further, certain regional variations, such as the cadences discussed above, may be hypothetically conceptualized through the concept of thrift. Although a common exemplar may underlie León 8 and some manuscripts of the Rioja tradition (a possibility suggested by the graphic similarities in Exx. 1 and 2), the two traditions prefer different cadences in some contexts (e.g. Tables 4 and 5 above). While the different ways of navigating these cadence types were known in both dialects, the two dialects have developed different tendencies in each of these cadential contexts. Although these variants are witnessed within a literate culture, they are compatible with the process of oral thrift hypothesised by Treitler.

The musical milieu of the Old Hispanic rite differs from that of the Carolingians in important ways. The early Franco-Roman Mass manuscripts demonstrate a close commitment to the versions transmitted from centralized exemplars. Because of the near

uniformity of these sources, claims by scholars of Frankish and Roman chant that a variant tradition underlies them have relied solely on indirect evidence. In the Old Hispanic material, however, we have identified evidence for a variant tradition-- during the time of notation-- among different branches of a single chant tradition, with specificity beyond what was possible in previous scholarship. The Old Hispanic evidence thus leads us away from the interpretative terrain of the 'broadly fixed' Franco-Roman Mass Proper, whose central place in scholarly discourse over the last 150 years has set so much of our discipline's agenda.